

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>		<b>Applicant(s)</b>		
	09/912,341		YUKI ET AL.		
	<b>Examiner</b>		<b>Art Unit</b>		
	Jason T. Whipkey		2612		

**All Participants:**

(1) Jason T. Whipkey.

(2) John Krause.

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 24 February 2006

**Time:** ~11:00 a.m.

**Type of Interview:**

☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:  
*N/A*

Claims discussed:  
*15 and 16*

Prior art documents discussed:  
*Hashimoto (USP 6,956,605)*

**Part II.**


SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:  
*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
 NG00 YEN YU  
 PRIMARY EXAMINER

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner notified the attorney that new art has been discovered that would result in a rejection under 35 USC 102(e). The examiner also noted that the rejection could be overcome with an Examiner's Amendment to change "different areas" to "different sizes". The attorney indicated Applicant's approval of the amendment in a phone call on February 28, 2006 at 5:30 p.m. .